1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 2 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. BATTAGLIA, JUDGE PRESIDING 3 IN RE INCRETIN-BASED THERAPIES) CASE NO. 13-MD-2452-AJB 4 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION, 5 6 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA JUNE 2, 2015 7 2:06 P.M. AS TO ALL RELATED AND MEMBER CASES) 8 9 10 11 12 13 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: STATUS CONFERENCE 14 15 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 OFFICIAL REPORTER: JEANNETTE N. HILL, C.S.R. 22 U.S. COURTHOUSE 333 WEST BROADWAY, RM 420 23 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101 (619) 702-3905 24 REPORTED BY STENOTYPE, TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER 25 JUNE 2, 2015

AVAILABLE AT PUBLIC TERMINAL FOR VIEWING ONLY

2 TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES 1 FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: RYAN THOMPSON 2 WATTS GUERRA LLP 5250 PRUE ROAD, SUITE 525 3 SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78240 MAXWELL S. KENNERLY 4 BEASLEY FIRM, LLC 5 1125 WALNUT STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107 6 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: DOUGLAS R. MARVIN 7 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP 725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W. 8 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 9 KENNETH J. KING PEPPER HAMILTON LLP 10 THE NEW YORK TIMES BUILDING 37TH FLOOR, 620 EIGHTH AVENUE 11 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10018-1405 12 ALSO PRESENT: MATTHEW LAHANA, LAW CLERK TO 13 JUDGE HIGHBERGER 14 15 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 22 23 24 25 JUNE 2, 2015

AVAILABLE AT PUBLIC TERMINAL FOR VIEWING ONLY

2.0

SAN DIEGO), CALIFORNIA;	TUESDAY,	JUNE 2,	2015;	2:06 P.M.
-----------	----------------	----------	---------	-------	-----------

DEPUTY CLERK: CALLING MATTER FOUR ON CALENDAR, CASE

NUMBER 13MD2452, IN RE INCRETIN MIMETICS PRODUCTS LIABILITY

LITIGATION, ON FOR STATUS CONFERENCE.

THE COURT: HI, EVERYBODY. JUDGE BATTAGLIA HERE. I KNOW WE HAVE A GROUP OF YOU ON THE PHONE. I HAVE YOUR LIST OF ATTENDEES. WE'LL MAKE THAT COURT'S EXHIBIT 1 TO THE HEARING SO ALL OF YOUR APPEARANCES ARE RECORDED. AND JUDGE HIGHBERGER IS ON THE ROAD. AND WE HAVE HIS CLERK -- IS IT MATTHEW?

MR. LAHANA: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: HI. -- AND HE IS GOING TO BE MONITORING THIS.

I KNOW FROM YOUR CALLS EARLIER -- OR SOME CALLS

EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE A PLAN IN PLACE TO PROCEED WITH THE

FILING OF THE PREEMPTION MOTION ON SCHEDULE. AND SINCE I'M

GOING TO BE GONE OUT OF THE COUNTRY STARTING TOMORROW UNTIL

ABOUT THE TIME YOUR THINGS ARE FILED, I JUST KIND OF WOULD LIKE

TO KNOW WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO DO TO ME WHILE I'M GONE.

SO WHAT'S THIS PLAN? WHO CAN TELL ME WHAT YOU FOLKS ANTICIPATE IT'S GOING TO LOOK LIKE? ANYBODY?

MR. THOMPSON: YOUR HONOR, RYAN THOMPSON FOR THE PLAINTIFFS. AS FAR AS A PLAN AT THIS POINT AS TO WHAT THINGS MIGHT LOOK LIKE, I THINK THERE ARE SOME DISCUSSIONS STILL TO BE HAD BETWEEN PLAINTIFFS AND DEFENDANTS AS IT RELATES TO ANY POTENTIAL AGREEMENT ON THINGS LIKE PAGE NUMBERS OR THE LIKE.

2.0

AT THIS POINT I THINK THAT PLAINTIFFS ARE STILL
CONTEMPLATING THE POSSIBILITY OF FILING AN AFFIRMATIVE MOTION
ON PREEMPTION. AND WE RELAYED THAT TO DEFENDANTS IN
PRELIMINARY CONVERSATIONS AND WE WILL CONTINUE THAT DIALOGUE
AND HOPEFULLY REACH AN AGREEMENT ON PAGE NUMBERS.

I THINK AT THIS POINT PLAINTIFFS ARE FINE WITH FOLLOWING PAGE NUMBERS AS SET BY THE RULES, YOU KNOW, SUBJECT TO ANY AGREEMENTS MADE WITH THE DEFENDANTS OR GUIDANCE BY THE COURT.

THE COURT: OKAY. AND SO ANY AGREEMENTS YOU FOLKS
REACH, RUN THEM BY MY LAW CLERK, LEX, AND SHE WILL GET WORD TO
ME IN CASE THERE IS SOME CONCERN. I MEAN, 200 PAGES OR
SOMETHING ISN'T GOING TO HAPPEN, BUT SOMETHING REASONABLE WE
COULD PROBABLY TOLERATE.

AND I'M A LITTLE CONCERNED ABOUT THIS FREE-FLOWING IDEA OF COMPETING MOTIONS. I'M NOT SURE WHAT THE VALUE WOULD BE.

LET'S ASSUME THE DEFENSE IS GOING TO FILE AS THEY'VE
ASKED TO DO IN THE PAST OR HAVE DONE IN PART AND WE DEFERRED IT
OR DEFLECTED IT. WHAT DO YOU GAIN, MR. THOMPSON, BY AN
AFFIRMATIVE MOTION YOURSELF? IS IT A CONCERN OVER GETTING MORE
PAGES TO PRESS YOUR POINTS, OR SOMETHING THAT I'M NOT PICKING
UP?

MR. THOMPSON: WELL, YOUR HONOR -- AND I MIGHT

DEFER, ON WHAT WE PICK UP, TO PEOPLE ON THE BRIEFING SIDE OF

2.0

THE THINGS, WHICH I DON'T CLAIM TO BE. BUT AS FAR AS PAGE
LIMITS GOES, WE'RE NOT LOOKING TO INCREASE THE VOLUME OF PAPERS
PUT ON THE COURT BY DOING AN AFFIRMATIVE MOTION.

THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, IF SOMEONE ELSE ON THE

PLAINTIFFS' SIDE WANTS TO ADDRESS IT. I JUST DON'T KNOW THAT I

GET IT, OTHER THAN NEEDING EITHER MORE SPACE OR MORE -- YEAH,

MORE SPACE, FRANKLY. BUT SOMEBODY ENLIGHTEN ME.

MR. KENNERLY: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS MR. KENNERLY.

WHAT WE ENVISION OFF OF THAT IS NOT JUST A BUNCH OF ADDITIONAL

PAGES TO MAKE AN ARGUMENT, BUT WE BELIEVE THERE ARE A DISCRETE

NUMBER OF FACTUAL ISSUES THAT ARE NOT GENUINELY DISPUTED, THAT

WE BELIEVE THAT IF THE COURT AGREES THEY ARE NOT GENUINELY

DISPUTED WOULD BE DISPOSITIVELY IN OUR FAVOR. AND IF WE DON'T

HAVE A MOTION FOR THAT, WE CAN'T CREATE A CLEAR RECORD.

SO WE DON'T EVEN THINK WE HAVE 25 PAGES OF IT. IT
WOULD BE VERY NARROWLY FOCUSED AND IT WOULD NOT BE AN EFFORT TO
PREEMPTIVELY ADDRESS ISSUES BY THE DEFENDANTS. IT WOULD BE A
SHORT, CONCRETE VERSION OF IT. IF WE DIDN'T HAVE THAT, WE
WOULDN'T HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT THAT COMPONENT OF THE
RECORD THAT WE BELIEVE IS NOT GENUINELY DISPUTED, AND WOULD
SUPPORT THE COURT ENTERING SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST THE
DEFENDANTS ON PREEMPTION.

THE COURT: IT WOULDN'T BE FEASIBLE TO DO THAT IN

SOME COURSE, SOME ASPECT OF OPPOSITION. YOU FEEL AFFIRMATIVELY

ADDRESSING IT WOULD MAKE IT MOST CLEAR FOR PURPOSES OF THE

COHRT!S	RFVTFW	$\cap \mathbb{R}$	T.ATFR	APPELLATE	BEN1EM2

MR. KENNERLY: YES, YOUR HONOR. AND WE WOULD BE CONCERNED THAT IF WE DIDN'T HAVE OUR OWN OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT IT CLEARLY, THEN THE ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE SOMETHING LIKE A 50-PAGE RESPONSE, WHICH WE DON'T THINK WOULD BE APPROPRIATE OR USEFUL TO THE COURT. WE WOULD RATHER HAVE SOMETHING VERY NARROWLY FOCUSED THAT CREATES A CLEAR RECORD.

THE COURT: WELL, THAT IS HELPFUL. THANK YOU FOR BEING SPECIFIC. I UNDERSTAND YOUR POINT.

BUT THIS POINT THE DEFENSE ARE FILING FOR SURE IS MY ANTICIPATION. SOMEBODY ON THE DEFENSE WANT TO COMMENT?

MR. MARVIN: THAT IS CORRECT, YOUR HONOR. AND AT THE LAST STATUS CONFERENCE -- THIS IS DOUGLAS MARVIN -- AT THE LAST STATUS CONFERENCE YOU ASKED WHETHER IT WOULD BE SEPARATE MOTIONS BY EACH DEFENDANT OR A JOINT MOTION ON BEHALF OF ALL OF THE DEFENDANTS.

THE COURT: RIGHT.

MR. MARVIN: AND THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS IT WOULD BE A JOINT MOTION.

THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, GREAT NEWS.

WELL, I APPRECIATE THE INSIGHT BECAUSE NOW I KNOW
WHAT I WILL LIKELY SEE UPON RETURN. AND CONTINUE YOUR
DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THE PAGES. IT SOUNDS LIKE THE DATES ARE
OTHERWISE FINE AS WE PREVIOUSLY SET THEM OUT.

ANY AGREEMENTS YOU COME TO, THOUGH, RELAY TO MY LAW

CLERK, LEX, SO WE HAVE A HEADS-UP AS TO WHAT TO EXPECT, AND GET THE PASS ON ANYTHING THAT MAY BE UNUSUAL OR ATYPICAL.

AT THIS POINT WHAT THE PLAINTIFFS SAY THEY ARE

CONTEMPLATING, NOT COMMITTED TO, I DON'T FIND TO BE PROBLEMATIC

IF IT'S GOING TO BE ALONG THE LINES MR. KENNERLY AND OTHERS

HAVE EXPRESSED.

SO I APPRECIATE YOUR INDULGING THE EXTRA TIME HERE SO
I HAVE A COMFORT LEVEL AS I LEAVE THE JURISDICTION. IS THERE
ANYTHING ELSE EITHER SIDE WANTS TO DISCUSS IN THIS REGARD,
EXCEPT FOR PERHAPS AS YOU REQUESTED, SETTING UP A FURTHER
STATUS CONFERENCE? ANYTHING ELSE BESIDES THAT?

MR. KING: YOUR HONOR, IT'S KEN KING FOR LILLY. I
KNOW WE HAD TOLD YOUR CLERK WE COULD MOVE THE THYROID STATUS
CONFERENCE TO A LATER DATE. IF YOUR HONOR WANTS A BRIEF
UPDATE, I'M PREPARED TO GIVE IT. IF NOT, WE CAN WAIT.

THE COURT: NO. WE CAN WAIT. SO WHEN WOULD YOU

FOLKS LIKE TO TOUCH BASE AGAIN, OR SHOULD WE WAIT AND LET THE

MOTIONS PLAY OUT ON THE SCHEDULE THEREON? WHAT IS YOUR

PREFERENCES?

MR. THOMPSON: YOUR HONOR, RYAN THOMPSON FOR THE PLAINTIFFS. WE HAD DISCUSSED WITH SOME OF THE DEFENDANTS

SETTING A TIME EITHER IN LATE JULY OR EARLY AUGUST AS A PLACEHOLDER. I DON'T HAVE A STRONG OPINION IN THAT REGARD.

OBVIOUSLY, WHATEVER WORKS FOR THE COURT WILL WORK FOR US. I HAD INITIALLY PROPOSED AUGUST 10TH, WHICH WOULD GET US PAST THE

REBUTTAL, EXPERT REPORTS ON GENERAL CAUSATION, AND BRIEFING ON
THE PREEMPTION MOTIONS. BUT SUBJECT TO SOME TIME IN THAT TIME
PERIOD, WE THOUGHT A PLACEHOLDER IN THERE MIGHT BE GOOD.
THE COURT: OKAY. MR. KING AND OTHERS ON THE
DEFENSE, DOES THAT WEEK LOOK LIKE A GOOD TIME TO TARGET A
FURTHER STATUS AND PERHAPS WEAVE IN THE THYROID CASES AT THAT
TIME, UNLESS SOMETHING ON THAT FRONT BREAKS SOONER?
MR. KING: KEN KING FOR LILLY. THAT IS FINE WITH ME.
I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE OTHER DEFENDANTS.
THE COURT: LET'S PICK A SPECIFIC DATE. THAT MIGHT
BE MORE PRODUCTIVE. THE 10TH I AM GOING TO HAVE A LONG
CRIMINAL CALENDAR, SO WE COULD GO THE 11TH, 12TH OR 13TH.
ANYTHING IN THOSE DAYS THAT SOMEONE WANTS TO MAKE A
PITCH FOR?
MR. THOMPSON: THE 11TH WOULD WORK FOR PLAINTIFFS,
YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: ANYBODY ON THE DEFENSE SIDE THAT COULDN'T
MAKE AUGUST 11TH WORK?
HEARING NO OPPOSITION, DO YOU LIKE THIS 2:00 TIME?
IS THIS CONDUCIVE, OR WOULD YOU PREFER 10:00 THAT DAY? ANY
SPECIFIC PREFERENCE?
MR. THOMPSON: FROM PLAINTIFFS' PERFECTIVE, EITHER
WOULD BE FINE. THESE AFTERNOON CONFERENCES WORK, BUT IF

THE COURT: LET'S SHOOT FOR 2:00 UNLESS SOMEBODY ON

SOMEONE NEEDS MORNING THAT IS FINE, AS WELL.

24

25

oliment in the control of the contro

24

25